

Brett Foster (#6089)  
Grant Foster (#7202)  
Tamara Kapaloski (#13471)  
**DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP**  
111 S. Main Street, Suite 2100  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone: (801) 933-7360  
Facsimile: (801) 933-7373  
foster.brett@dorsey.com  
foster.grant@dorsey.com  
kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Blendtec Inc.*

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION**

---

**BLENDTEC INC.**, a Utah corporation,  
  
Plaintiff,

vs.

**BLENDJET, INC.**, a Delaware corporation,  
  
Defendant.

**PLAINTIFF BLENDTEC INC.’S  
MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENAS  
TO BUSINESS PARTNERS  
(BLENDFRESH AND BLENDID)**

Civil No. 2:21-cv-00668-TC-DBP

Judge Tena Campbell  
Magistrate Judge Dustin B. Pead

---

Pursuant to FRCP 26, 34, and 45(d)(3), Blendtec moves to quash Requests 7-8 in subpoenas served upon two third parties that have business relationships with Blendtec (Blendfresh and Blendid) (the “Business Partner Subpoenas”) (**Exhibit A**). Blendtec served objections to the subpoenas on December 7, 2022 (**Exhibits B-C**). Blendtec also attempted to meet and confer with Blendjet on this issue, but Blendjet refused to meet and confer until after the deadline to respond to the subpoenas (**Exhibit D**).

As set forth in Blendtec’s objections (Exhibit B), requests 7-8 seek documents to which Blendtec has a personal or proprietary right. *See, e.g., Anderson v. Heartland Coca-Cola*, 2022 WL 444092 at \*3 (D. Kan. 2022) (“where the party seeking to challenge the subpoena has a personal right or privilege with respect to the subject matter requested in the subpoena” that party may move to quash subpoena) (unpublished). Request 7 seeks documents related to contractual agreements between Blendtec and the third parties. As such, Blendtec has a proprietary interest in them. *See Beaty v. Kan. Ath.*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 74206, at \*8 (D. Kan. 2020 (where party “is a party to the contracts sought” party has a right or privilege in the information) (rejecting argument that party lacked standing to object to subpoena); *North Alabama Fabricating Co. v. Bedeschi Mid-West Conveyor Co.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 157362, at \*2 (D. Kan. 2017) (“Because the information requested from nonparty Essar includes contracts, invoices, correspondence and other documents between Essar and Defendant Bedeschi . . . Defendants have a personal right or privilege with respect to the subject matter requested in the subpoena” and have “standing to object to the issuance of the subpoena”); *Indianapolis Airport v. Travelers Prop. Cas. Co.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45123, \*3 (S.D. Ind. 2015) (where subpoena seeks information regarding private contract, party to contract has personal right in documents).

Request 8 seeks documents that constitute Blendtec’s confidential information in which Blendtec has a strong proprietary interest. *See Curtis Park Grp. v. Allied World*, 2021 WL 1022703, at \*3 (D. Colo. 2021) (objection to subpoena based on “ownership interest” in subpoenaed documents is proper); *Malibu v. Doe*, 2013 WL 24526, at \*2 (D. Colo. 2013) (court may quash subpoena based on a party’s claim of privilege, personal interest, or proprietary interest); *Nunes v. Rushton*, 2015 WL 3537018, at \*3, n.5 (D. Utah 2015) (addressing party’s

objections to subpoena stemming from “personal interest or a proprietary interest in the documents”). Further, the subpoenaed documents are within Blendtec’s possession or control and party discovery is ongoing. Blendtec will produce relevant documents in response to proper document requests, and there is no need to burden third parties at this point. *See Martley v. City of Basehor*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79427, at \*8-9 (D. Kan. 2022) (“document requests to a party, rather than subpoenas to the custodial non-party, are the appropriate method to obtain discovery”) (granting party’s motion to quash subpoena designed to circumvent Rule 34).

Blendtec seeks FRCP 37(a)(5)(A)(ii) attorneys’ fees.

DATED this 9th day of December, 2022.

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

/s/ Tamara L. Kapaloski

Brett Foster (#6089)

Grant Foster (#7202)

Tamara L. Kapaloski (#13471)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Blendtec Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 9th day of December, 2022, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was filed with the Court's CM/ECF system and served on the following counsel of record via the CM/ECF notification system:

Patrick M. McGill: [pmcgill@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:pmcgill@sheppardmullin.com)

Lisa M. Martens: [lmartens@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:lmartens@sheppardmullin.com)

Martin R. Bader: [mbader@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:mbader@sheppardmullin.com)

Nathan D. Thomas: [nthomas@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:nthomas@parsonsbehle.com)

Elizabeth M. Butler: [lbutler@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:lbutler@parsonsbehle.com)

/s/ Tamara L. Kapaloski